



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1999

No. 95

## Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

The Psalmist gives us the secret of a truly great day:

*Commit your way to the Lord and trust also in Him and He shall bring it to pass. I rest in the Lord and wait patiently for him.—Psalm 37:5,7.*

Let us pray.

Blessed God, Your omniscience both comforts and alarms us. You know all about us: our strengths and weaknesses, our hopes and our hurts. So often, instead of waiting patiently for You, we try to forge ahead on our own strength. Here we are in the middle of another week. There is work to be done before the weekend. Help us to believe that what we commit to You will come to pass if You deem it best for us.

We need to experience that rest in mind and body which comes when we do what You guide us to do and then leave the results to You. Bless the Senators with the profound peace that comes from giving You their burdens and receiving Your resiliency and refreshment. May this be a great day because they, and all of us who work with them, decide to rest in Your presence and wait patiently for Your power to strengthen us. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator ALLARD is now designated to lead the Senate in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD) led the pledge of allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately begin consideration of the foreign operations appropriations bill. It is hoped that significant progress can be made in an effort to complete action on the bill today. I might interject that I think that is certainly possible, maybe by early afternoon.

During today's session, the Senate may also begin consideration of any other appropriations bills on the calendar. It is the intention of the majority leader to complete action on a number of appropriations bills prior to the Fourth of July recess. Therefore, Senators can expect votes throughout the remainder of the week.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of S. 1234, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1234) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the committee was provided an allocation

virtually identical to last year's bill of \$12.6 billion. Although it is \$1.8 billion below the request, I think it effectively manages our global responsibilities, and it does so within the budget caps.

For the past few years, the bill has emphasized funding in two areas—export promotion and growth in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. This bill sustains that commitment—in fact, expands support for export promotion by \$20 million for a total of \$785 million to the Export-Import Bank.

This year, we have added recovery and reconstruction in Southeast Europe to our priority list.

While I expect the Europeans to bear the lion's share of responsibility for reconstruction, we have concrete trade interests in regional economic recovery and security interests in promoting stability and democracy.

With funds straight lined, this becomes a zero sum game. We have to reach consensus on tradeoffs and priorities.

There is no question that this will mean reductions in other accounts—but it's time to recognize priorities. There are obvious and easy cuts that the administration can make. Just as one example, the administration has asked for another \$70 million for Haiti after spending billions in Haiti, with little to show for it. In fact, recent press accounts report an increase in drug trafficking through Haiti, and we have failed at every turn to restore a legitimate government.

This is just one example where I think the administration could cut back in order to serve more urgent priorities.

There are others. The request from the administration is redundant in the area of peacekeeping. They have asked for funds for a global peace keeping initiative, a regional Africa peacekeeping account and the Africa Crisis Response Initiative which trains peacekeepers.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7835

I think we can and should shift priorities. We have just waged a war in Europe, and we need to build the foundation for sustaining the peace in the aftermath of that war.

The Balkans Initiative in this bill does three things to serve what I see as our long term interests: It rids the region of Milosevic by declaring Serbia a terrorist state; we increase funding for stability and recovery; and we condition funds to Russia on total cooperation with NATO in Kosovo.

Let me elaborate.

In section 525, the bill establishes Serbia's status as a terrorist nation. With this terrorist designation, the administration cannot provide bilateral or support multilateral aid, and Belgrade is stripped of protections under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

This in turn, will allow Kosovars to take Milosevic to court for damages rendered during his brutal war of ethnic annihilation.

The administration has complained that this designation is inflexible and unreasonable, that Serbia is not the same as the other countries on the terrorism list because they don't sponsor groups such as Hezbollah.

Frankly, I am hard pressed to understand the difference between thugs blowing up a village with a car bomb or thugs shelling and burning a village to the ground.

The intent and the impact are the same. In both instances, innocent civilians are the targets and the victims.

The second important change in the bill affects funding. We have increased and changed the funding mix to fulfill two goals. We have tried to promote refugee confidence to return home, and relieve the pressure on the front-line states.

The administration requested \$393 million for Eastern and Central Europe which included \$55 million for Serbia and \$175 million for Bosnia.

I have taken out Serbia's funds, cut back on Bosnia and added \$142 million for a total of \$535 million.

Of the total the bill earmarks \$150 million for Kosovo, \$85 million for Albania, \$60 million for Romania, \$55 million for Macedonia, \$45 million for Bulgaria, and \$35 million for Montenegro, leaving \$105 million unallocated for other regional uses.

We have also earmarked funds within the Kosovo account to promote internal stability and confidence including the provision of \$20 million to train and equip a Kosovo security force. Again, the administration had complained bitterly about this provision on the grounds that it arms the KLA at a time when the agreement is seeking to dismantle their capabilities.

There is nothing in the bill which calls for arming or supporting the KLA. In fact, the administration has plans to train and equip a police force and has estimated that this will cost \$25 million. The bill is not consistent with the planning underway. It simply earmarks funds for a security force

which I view as essential to any Kosovar having confidence the past will not be repeated.

Members of the KLA may very well be included in a security force, but that is not a decision for us to make. A Kosovo civilian government should make all decisions regarding recruitment standards, organization and supervision of internal security. Autonomy can not be preserved without security—that is just what this \$20 million will launch.

In addition, to strengthen democracy, we have provided \$20 million to support the development of local government institutions. This support should help the Kosovars rebuild independent judicial, legislative, and executive branches of self-government, as well as help at the local municipal level.

The United States made a commitment at Rambouillet to support a three year period of autonomy which would be followed by some kind of final decision on political status. Specifically, the Secretary of State pledged to support a referendum on independence if that is the course Kosovars chose.

I think we all hope that a change of government in Belgrade might produce conditions which would allow Kosovo to maintain some kind of tie with a democratic federation. In the interim, however, Kosovo must develop the capabilities and institutions to govern themselves, which I believe these funds will support.

Finally, the bill conditions future Russian aid on total cooperation with NATO on peacekeeping. The administration seemed caught by surprise when Russian troops marched into and took up positions at the Pristina airport. Frankly, I was surprised that they did not take up positions along the Belgrade-Pristina road. This move was calculated and inevitable—notwithstanding senior officials' attempts to explain it was just a few rogue troops.

If stability is to be restored in Kosovo, the Russian's cannot be allowed to maintain a client relationship with Serbia which may lead to de facto partition of the country.

To prevent this outcome, we link Russian aid to the Secretary of State certifying that the Russians have not established a separate zone of operational control, and that their forces are completely integrated under NATO command and control.

In the last few days, the Secretary of Defense seems to have worked out an arrangement that may secure these objectives. We all certainly hope so. But, just as the administration was surprised by the dash to control the Pristina airport, they could be surprised by difficulties in implementing the agreement. We must maintain some leverage to assure there is full compliance with the current expectations.

And, lest anyone doubt the relevance of this leverage, I suggest a review of

the vote to condition aid to Russia on a withdrawal timetable from the Baltics. This was a few years back. Every leader in the region called me after the 89-11 Senate vote to congratulate the Senate for securing immediate negotiations which produced the desired result.

In other words, what we did in the early nineties was to condition Russian aid on withdrawal of troops from the Baltic countries. Shortly after we had that vote in the Senate, the Russian troops were out of the Baltic countries.

Beyond, the Balkans, this bill maintains United States interests in the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union and sustains our financial commitment to crucial allies ranging from Israel to Indonesia.

I also want to mention the increase in this bill's funding levels for the surveillance and treatment of infectious diseases. A recent process report noted that children and vulnerable populations are dying at a staggering rate of treatable and often preventable diseases. Thanks to Senator LEAHY's commitment, we are now in our third year of a multi-year strategy to significantly increase the U.S. commitment to control and prevent infectious diseases.

Finally, let me say that there is no question we could have spent more on foreign operations program. Senators LEAHY and I have both expressed strong support for increasing foreign assistance initiatives. However, working together, we have produced a bill which lives within the budget caps. It is very similar to the bill we passed in the Senate just 1 year ago with an overwhelming bipartisan majority vote of 90-3. Senator LEAHY and I certainly hope that will be the result again this year.

Before passing the baton over to my friend and colleague from Vermont, I thank him, at the beginning of what we think will be a rather short debate, for his leadership and cooperation in producing a bipartisan bill that went through the Appropriations Committee without dissent and we think has widely accommodated the interests of Members who take a particular interest in this bill every year.

We anticipate very few amendments. I will say in advance what I hope to do is, sometime before noon, seek consent that all amendments be in by a reasonable time today—probably by noon—within an hour from now. What I hope we can do is ask for a consent agreement to have all amendments filed before noon. There is every reason to believe this bill should be handled very quickly, and we hope we will have maximum cooperation from other Members of the Senate to do that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Kentucky for his comments, and as always, when working on this piece of legislation with

him, it has been a pleasure, notwithstanding the lack of allocations we had.

I concur with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky that we should try to wrap this up at a time certain. I will join with him at the appropriate time in a unanimous consent request that all amendments be filed by noon today. The reason I mention that now is so that, on this side of the aisle, people are alerted we will be making a request of that nature. I think it can be done.

With the agreement entered into last night by the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Democratic leader, there is an effort to move some of these bills forward so we can get on to the question of the Patients' Bill of Rights when we come back after the July 4 recess. I urge Senators who have amendments to come to the Chamber and offer them.

This bill was reported by the Appropriations Committee with actually no debate and no amendments. One of the reasons, unfortunately, for the lack of any debate is the amount of funds in this bill is so far below what is needed to adequately fund our foreign policy priorities that there is little point in debating it.

Even if Members want to make changes in the bill, there is no way to pay for it. Everything in it is already underfunded. The bill is \$800 million below the 1999 level. It is \$1.9 billion below the President's request. No one can accuse the President of failing to try to protect this country's global interests. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the Congress. Devoting less than 1 percent of the Federal budget to our foreign policy is not responsible.

What this means is we are unable to meet our commitments—our solemn commitments—to the international financial institutions. We did not provide any funds for the President's expanded threat reduction initiative, to dismantle Russian nuclear weapons, to protect fissile material, and pay for other nonproliferation and security programs. We spent hundreds of billions of dollars—literally trillions of dollars—to defend against the threat of the then-Soviet Union.

We are unwilling to spend a tiny, tiny, tiny fraction of 1 percent of that same money now to dismantle some of those nuclear weapons and protect the material from them—material that can fall into the hands of people who do not have the kind of controls that were imposed at the time we were spending hundreds of billions of dollars to protect ourselves. It goes beyond pennywise and pound-foolish; it goes into irresponsibility, especially in a nuclear age. I, frankly, cannot understand how we have gotten to this point.

We had to cut funding for many of the programs of special interest to Senators, i.e., the Peace Corps. Is there any foreign policy program in this country that we can point to with more

pride than the Peace Corps? Yet we cut that.

With additional funds, we could do a great deal more to promote American exports in extremely competitive foreign markets. Other countries that do not begin to have the ability to export as we do are spending more money in trying to build up their foreign markets because they know that will create jobs, good-paying jobs, in their country. We step back and say we do not want to do this.

We can improve global health at a time when infectious diseases are our greatest threat after nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. There is no major infectious disease that is more than one or two plane rides away from our shores. And this isn't a case where we are showing some great humanitarian gesture to try to stop infectious disease in other continents; it protects us. Not only does it protect the people there, but ebola plague, a resistant strain of tuberculosis, and any other number of things can begin in one country and within hours be in a major airport in our country and then in our population. When it gets here, we will spend fortunes trying to get rid of it. We will not spend pennies in trying to stop it in the first place.

We should be doing more to protect the Earth's natural resources. They are under siege on every continent. Our health and our economy depend on a clean environment. Yet we spend a pittance as we see the environment continue to degrade, almost as though we think as Americans we can look at the borders of our great country and assume that we determine the environment for our people just within those borders.

The environment is determined by the rain forests of the world, by the "desertization" of large parts of the world, by chemical and other dumping in our oceans in other parts of the world. If we want to protect us—a quarter of a billion Americans—we ought to be concerned about what happens in other parts of the world.

Half the world is asking for help in building new democratic societies, but we have little to offer. For decades, again, we spent hundreds of billions of dollars—trillions of dollars—saying we were going to stand up for democracy, we were going to stand up against communism; we wanted democracy in the world.

Well, the Berlin Wall has come down. The Iron Curtain has rusted through. These countries are saying: Thank God America is there; they can help us form our democracy. And we say: When we thought you would be Communists, we could spend billions and billions and billions of dollars to contain you, but now that you want to be democratic, we don't really have even a tiny fraction of that amount to help you become democratic, to help you develop courts and a free press and a civil system, and on and on.

We should double or triple our support for international peacekeeping,

especially in places such as Sierra Leone where NATO cannot intervene but the atrocities are far worse. Daily we see it in Kosovo. We almost have this thought that if we do not turn on CNN and see atrocities, they are not occurring. I suggest that Senators read the Intelligence Digest, read the free press, when they do report them and think of these atrocities that we could help stop.

If we do not do anything in these areas, all the areas I have talked about, because we save some pennies today by not doing anything in these areas, we are saddling future generations of Americans with far greater costs, and as we go into the next century, we saddle future Americans with a more dangerous and unstable world, a world that is increasingly polarized between the very rich and the extraordinarily poor.

I have little doubt that the President would veto a foreign operations bill at this level.

Having said all that, Senator McConnell and I did the best we could with the allocation we received. We have tried to allocate the funds we had in the most responsible way possible.

I thank the senior Senator from Kentucky for the bipartisan way he worked with me to put this bill together. It has become a tradition of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont to work together on these issues. I am grateful to him. I think what he has done serves the Senate well. I think it serves the American people well.

Obviously, if I were in Senator McConnell's position, I might have done some things differently, just as he would look at some of the things I have asked to be put in this bill and are included and do them differently. But on the whole, we have worked together to write a balanced piece of legislation. In fact, the funds are so tight, the balance is so delicate, I cannot imagine how I might accept any amendments, Democrat or Republican, to cut or add funds in this bill. This is a Rubik's cube, a small Rubik's cube but a Rubik's cube nonetheless, we have tried to put together.

I think we Senators should thank the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, the senior Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and the senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, who did their best to give us a fair allocation within the limits they had to work with.

But if I might, before I yield the floor, mention a couple issues I am especially concerned about. One is the Global Environment Facility. It is one of the world's leading international environmental organizations. It funds projects to protect biodiversity, to prevent ocean pollution, to protect the ozone, and to prevent climate change.

Take a poll of the American people. Ask them how many are in favor of just those items. A resounding majority of the American people would be in

favor of protecting biodiversity, preventing ocean pollution, protecting the ozone, preventing climate change. For this endeavor, the administration requested \$143 million for fiscal year 2000. That includes \$35 million we owe already in prior year arrears. This bill contains just \$25 million for arrears, and that is not acceptable.

Ask the American people if they have a justifiable concern about terrorism, and they will say yes. Those of us, the chairman and myself, who have access to the most current intelligence of our intelligence agencies know that the fear of terrorism is justifiable. The President requested \$33 million for antiterrorism training programs. Under our allocation, we could only provide him \$20 million. The request also included \$10 million for a new antiterrorism program to help developing countries strengthen their border control systems—again, because the terrorism that may show up in those developing countries is a plane ride away from our shores. Even though the President's antiterrorism initiative is a good one, we cannot include any funds for it. Not that we don't want to fund these programs; the money is not there to do it.

There are a lot of other programs I could mention that need additional funds. Hopefully, before this session is over, we may get a revised allocation that will allow us to go into some of these areas. But right now I think we should act on the bill to move the process forward.

Again, I salute the chairman and ranking member of the full committee, the distinguished Senators from Alaska and West Virginia, for pushing so hard to go forward. The fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky and I have the working relationship we do, I think, helped us move forward with this. We should go forward with the process. Hopefully the other body will start moving on theirs. I think we could complete action on this bill in a very few hours. Senators who have amendments should not delay to offer them.

As I said earlier, to preserve the delicate balance of this bill, I expect to be opposing amendments that do not have suitable offsets.

With that, I yield the floor. The Senator from Kentucky and I are now the humble servants of the Senate, ready to start the sausage grinder forward. Hopefully, we can end up with a product very quickly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank my good friend from Vermont for his cooperation in developing this bill on a bipartisan basis. I agree with him that without the allocation that Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD provided for us, we couldn't have even done this well. I do think that even with this, some would argue inadequate allocation, we can meet our responsibilities around the globe. I believe we have done that in this bill.

Now the Senator from Kansas is here and has an important amendment to be offered.

Let me just mention to all Members of the Senate, Senator LEAHY and I, at about 10:30, are going to propound a unanimous consent request asking that all amendments to this bill be submitted by noon, which we think will help the Senate dispose of this measure in a timely fashion.

Mr. President, seeing the Senator from Kansas here, who has an amendment to offer, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1118

(Purpose: To amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to target assistance to support the economic and political independence of the countries of the South Caucasus and Central Asia)

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Vermont, for allowing me to bring forward this amendment. At this time, I rise to offer an amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, and I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 1118.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1119 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1118

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration, on behalf of myself and Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL], for himself and Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 1119 to amendment No. 1118.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On Page 9, line 3, strike all after "(c) Restriction through line 12 States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise to address the underlying second-degree amendment and to talk about the overall amendment itself and the area of the world with which we are dealing.

This amendment is an issue that has been heard in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee, both this Congress

and last, and has passed this time by a voice vote of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It passed by a majority vote in the last Congress. It deals with an important region of the world, and it deals with a difficult policy issue for the Senate and for our Government to consider.

The underlying bill itself is called the Silk Roads Strategy Act. It deals with eight countries, and it provides an overarching policy towards these countries in the south Caucasus and central Asia. Specifically the countries are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

I realize those are not common names of countries that people across the United States perhaps banter around, but I think they do know and recall with some knowledge the Silk Road, the old Silk Road made legendary many years ago, discovered and traversed by Marco Polo and many others who traveled throughout the region of central Asia.

It was really at that point in time the bridge; the Eurasian bridge was developed and brought commerce from Asia to Europe and from Europe to Asia. We are seeking to reinstate this Silk Road, a new Silk Road that would have an economic corridor along with a freedom corridor in central Asia and the south Caucasus.

You can see this region of the world. I wish this map were a little clearer. I hope Members can see where this region of the world is caught. These are all countries in the former Soviet Union. They are in the south of the former Soviet Union; they are recently independent nations. They had some independence before, but these are just recently coming out from underneath the rubble of the fall of the Soviet empire.

They are caught between world global forces that seek to have them under their control. The Russians continue the desire to have an unusual influence, would be the best way to put it. The Iranians sit right here and seek to have a greater influence in the region. They seek to dominate most of these nations that have a Muslim-based population. They seek, the Iranians, to radicalize and put governments in place that are militant fundamentalist governments. China then, off to this side of the region—what we are seeking to do is to create an area of democracy, an area of free enterprise, an area of independence free from these world powers that seek to dominate them, in a group of nations that seek to be united with the West, again, in a Eurasian corridor of commerce and freedom. That is the new Silk Road Strategy Act. That is what this bill is about.

Lest we forget and just look at it as a geographic area, as important as this region is, I hope we will look at the people in this region. We are talking about nearly 72 million people involved in these countries of the Silk Road. You can look at them: the Armenian

population of 3.4 million; the Azeri population of 7.8 million; on down, Uzbekistan being the biggest with over 23 million people yearning to be free, yearning to be associated with the West, yearning not to go back under Russian dominance or to be put under Iranian dominance or Chinese dominance, but yearning to be free and associated with the West. That is what this bill is about.

This is a sanctions lifting bill. It lifts a particular sanction, sanction section 907 that has a set of provisions limiting any sort of assistance, any sort of work of the United States with Azerbaijan, which is also a key country for this corridor, and it doesn't lift the sanctions. It merely provides a national interest waiver. So this doesn't lift it. The President still has to say it is in the national interest of the United States to waive this sanction, and then he has the authority.

So it simply provides that authority to the administration, which is in line with the Freedom Support Act, which we originally passed to support these newly independent countries that came about from the Soviet empire falling. This act authorizes assistance for all these countries, specific economic assistance, development of infrastructure assistance, border control assistance, as well as assistance in strengthening democracy, tolerance in the development of civil society.

Authority in this bill to provide assistance for these countries of the south Caucasus and central Asia is in addition to the authority to provide such assistance under the Freedom Support Act, but it does not provide any new resources. It simply allows us to offer these resources and assistance to these countries bilaterally and multilaterally. We can provide assistance programs to the entire region, working it in a package and saying to these countries: You are better off if you will work together and bond together to be able to stand before the forces that are seeking to dominate you once again.

Mr. President, I think the window of opportunity for the United States to effect positive change in this region will only be open for a short period of time. I think that is the very critical part of this bill and why we need to have this debate and pass this issue now.

The window is short. I want to show you some of the activity that is taking place in this region. I mentioned the militant fundamentalists' efforts taking place to seek domination of most of these countries that have a Muslim-based population.

This is a chart of Iranian worldwide export of terrorism and fundamentalism that we are putting up here. I want to highlight this region that we are talking about. Of the eight countries we are talking about, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have Iranians operating in this region. Afghanistan is operating here, seeking to put these countries

under militant fundamentalist control. They are doing this today.

As recently as 2 months ago, the President of Uzbekistan had an assassination attempt that was put forward by militant fundamentalists who seek to have him removed. He provides mostly a secular Muslim government. They said we want him out and we want a militant fundamentalist government in here, and we are going to do what we can, including trying to assassinate him. They are trying to destabilize the Fergana Valley in this area. My point is, look at this map. It looks similar to the map I just put up here, the countries of the Silk Road. The Iranians are funding this effort. They are going into the camps here and funding the populations in this area. They are doing this today. Members can check this. This is happening.

If we want to let these countries slip off and go into the militant fundamentalist camps so we have more places to fight terrorism and more countries we have to fight against that are willing to spawn hatred against the West, let's fail this bill, and with all due respect to the Senator from Kentucky, let's pass his amendment. We have a disagreement about this particular amendment, section 907. I think it is critical and important that we pass and eliminate this bilateral sanction that we have against Azerbaijan, which is much of the gateway for the flow of democracy and freedom throughout this region. Time is of the essence.

In my view, the single best way to consolidate our goals in the region is to promote regional cooperation and policies that will strengthen the sovereignty of each nation. Each of these countries has its own individual needs. However, many of the problems in the region overlap and are shared, and a number of common solutions and approaches can apply. That is why we have put together this overarching Silk Road strategy. This region has generally taken a back seat to U.S. foreign policy. We have generally deferred to Russia and to Iranian policy and said we are going to let these drift along. The problem with the drift is that people are going to feel the power vacuum. It is being fueled by the Iranians and pushed by the Russians and other outside influences that don't seek for them to have their freedom.

We have eight countries, as I noted earlier, most of which have secular Muslim governments, that are fighting to stave off the Iranian-style Islamic extremism, which are looking westward, and at great risk to themselves, they have considerable economic ties with the West—and I want to note as well, with Israel.

Many of these countries in this region have historic and ancient Jewish populations existing there as well; living, surviving, thriving, but if you put in these anti-Western militant fundamentalist, those populations, Jewish populations are going to be run out and these countries are not going to be having good relationships with Israel.

These countries are recovering from 70 years of Soviet domination. They need our help in all spheres, including human rights. No one is suggesting that these are Jeffersonian democracies yet. There is a lot of pessimistic talk about the prospects for democracy in this region. All of these countries have human rights violations.

At any given point in time, some of the human rights violations may seem worse than others. Here is our choice. Do we engage and try to make what difference we can? Or do we ignore and let the region drift without us, becoming either violently anti-Western, anti-American, or become, once again, an extension of Russia, China, or Iran? It is a pretty clear, simple choice. They seek our support.

Now, on the point of human rights—because I think a lot of people will say there are human rights violations in this region and we really ought to watch out for that and we should not support these areas. Again, I point out that this is a waiver authority to the President. He still has to certify and it will have the same standards as other human rights issues. Recently, we had the Israeli Minister for Trade and Industry, Natan Sharansky, a well-known international figure on human rights, here in Washington, together with the Foreign Minister of Uzbekistan. Mr. Sharansky's reason for being here was to make one point, which I thank him for making.

He said:

Look at the human rights situation and weigh this against the importance of the threat that is facing us. It is very important to engage and continue to encourage a positive process and the way to do this is to strengthen the role we are playing in the region.

He supported and endorsed this Silk Road Strategy Act in the region.

I want to look particularly at the second-degree amendment that my colleague from Kentucky put forward. I have immense respect for the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. He did excellent work on the overall bill, but we have a difference of opinion on section 907. I want to go specifically at this issue.

My overall amendment would provide a Silk Road Strategy Act for the entire region, providing a waiver authority in section 907. The second-degree amendment leaves the rest of the language but does not provide the national interest waiver on section 907. That is a key part of this bill, and that is why I oppose the second-degree amendment of my good colleague from Kentucky and my colleague from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, as well. We have a dispute on this. I want to go right at that issue of section 907.

With the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Congress, in the fall of 1992, adopted the Freedom Support Act. This was designed to provide financial and technical assistance to the newly independent states, those of the former Soviet Union. I want to put that map

back up here, if we could, so people can have that in mind. It was to aid them on a path toward democratic and market reforms. Because of the then ongoing conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia over the enclave Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenian supporters were successful in including language in section 907 singling out Azerbaijan—the only former Soviet republic so treated—for sanctions. I will put up here a map of that region so you can see specifically what this area looks like. This is the Armenia and Azerbaijan area and the Nagorno-Karabakh region, which was in dispute, and this was in 1992, mid-1993, and late 1993.

In 1992, at that point in time, we passed the Freedom Support Act and Armenian supporters got narrow, bilateral sanctions against Azerbaijan put in place, saying we think Azerbaijan is treating Armenia wrong, blocking it. Therefore, we want section 907, which removes the United States from providing any assistance to Azerbaijan. Bilateral sanctions, some of which have been lifted—the chairman of the committee has lifted portions of these, but not all have been lifted. We provide waiver authority for the lifting of these bilateral sanctions. That was 1992. The only former Soviet republic so treated was Azerbaijan. The 907 sanction prohibited the ability of the U.S. Government to provide direct bilateral assistance to Azerbaijan until the President determined that demonstrable steps had been taken in ceasing hostilities and lifting the embargo against Armenia. A cease-fire has been in place for the past 7 years since that time period.

Peace negotiations under the auspices of the OSCE group are ongoing.

To me, it makes no sense whatsoever to continue these 907 sanctions. Proponents of retaining 907 argue that the restrictions should remain in place until the Azerbaijan embargo against Armenia is lifted. In point of fact, however, it is Armenia's ongoing occupation of Nagorno-Karabakh and the surrounding territory. Armenia currently occupies about 20 percent of Azerbaijan in violation of international law. Both the OSCE and the U.N. have condemned this occupation.

This is the region on the map they are occupying against the OSCE and U.N. ruling. They both have said this is an international law violation, that Armenia is occupying 20 percent of Azerbaijan. This functionally prevents the opening of the borders between the two countries.

In an attempt to end the stalemate, the OSCE advanced a proposal calling for Armenia to withdraw from the occupied land in exchange for the reciprocal opening of rail and pipeline facilities by Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan has accepted the proposal. Armenia has rejected it. This would be pulling back from a 20 percent of lands, and then opening up the rail and pipe corridors. Azerbaijan accepted it. Armenia has not.

The imposition of 907, I think, was a bad idea in 1993. It was adopted over the strong objections of the Bush administration, and its repeal is strongly supported by the Clinton administration.

For the United States to continue unilateral imposition of sanctions against Azerbaijan—that is what we have—does not make sense from either a geostrategic-political point of view or an economic point of view.

This is much of the corridor for the Eurasian bridge that is going through Azerbaijan.

The energy potential of the Caspian is one facet of Azerbaijan's strategic significance to the West. The broader issue of the timing and development of the Iranian transit corridor and the sovereignty of the individual republics of the South Caucasus is also at stake.

This provision—I might note, as well, the Silk Road strategy—is strongly supported by all the countries in the region outside of the Armenians. I think it would be a great benefit to Armenia as well.

Continuing 907 is an impediment to the improved truce between the United States and Azerbaijan and the entire region. It undermines the ability of American companies to secure their substantial investments in the region, and prevents the U.S. Government from being a truly honest broker in the peace negotiations.

Repealing of section 907 would allow for commercial and technical assistance to aid in the development of infrastructure, trade, pipeline projects, and to further development of democracy so they don't fall into the hands of the Iranians or the Russians.

Further, with the ongoing political turmoil in Moscow, removal of 907 would allow Azerbaijan to participate in a partnership for peace and broader security programs, as well as market reform and democracy-building initiatives necessary to promote political stability in this potentially volatile region.

Some may suggest this is not the time to do this on 907. I don't know of a better time other than 907 having not been put on in the first place. It doesn't lift the sanction. It provides a waiver authority for the President to do it.

Some may say, well, this is at a particularly susceptible time in the peace process. I don't think that is accurate. The last real peace initiative was in 1997, calling for Armenia's withdrawal from the occupied territories in exchange for normalization of trade with Azerbaijan. This was rejected by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Unlike other provisions of the Freedom Assistant Act, I want to point out that section 907 does not provide for a national interest waiver. What we are doing here is making section 907 be in line with the rest of the Freedom Assistance Act in providing a national interest waiver.

The final point I want to make before yielding the floor for a discussion is,

again, I point out my deep respect for my colleagues from Kentucky and Michigan who are opposed to the overall national interest waiver on section 907. We just have a differing point of view on this.

But the issue is, we are talking about a region of the world—a Eurasian corridor—that has had historical roots in the old Silk Road. They know how to relate with one another, and they are in a tough neighborhood. They have the Russians bearing down on them with undue economic and other influence, and the President of Georgia has had several assassination attempts where the assassin fled to Russia.

Georgia wants this bill very much. They have undue influence from the Iranians, who are providing aid to many of these terrorist groups operating in the region and fomenting discontent because they know they are inherently weak at this time. The Chinese have a certain amount of influence, but it is really between the Russians and the Iranians. And they seek to be connected with us.

If you pull 907 out of this and its interest waiver, and you say, OK, we are going to do everything but 907, as the amendment provides, you block this part of the key corridor of providing economic trade, developmental assistance, and, through much of the region, its commerce and its activity will flow through Baku and Azerbaijan. This is a critical part of it. That is why, with all due respect, I oppose the second-degree amendment, ask my colleagues to vote against that and to support the underlying amendment without amendment, and pass this critical issue that we really need for U.S. foreign policy.

I thank my colleague.

I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

#### FILING OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

I ask unanimous consent that all first-degree amendments to be offered to the pending appropriations bill must be filed at the desk by 1 p.m. today, and, of course, other than the managers' amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I want to commend my friend and colleague from Kansas, first of all, for taking an interest in a part of the world that very few Members of Congress probably can find on a map. I share his view that this is an extraordinarily important part of the world.

As the Senator from Kansas pointed out, all of these countries are part of what used to be the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union very early on, in the wake of the end of the cold war, said: This is our "near abroad," sort of their version of the Monroe Doctrine, their

territory, and we were not thereby expected by them to be in that area. Nevertheless, the Russians don't make foreign policy for the United States. And we are in the process of trying to develop our own strong bilateral relations with each of those countries.

The Senator from Kansas has been in the forefront of advocating the importance of the United States having its own bilateral relations with each of those countries. I commend him for it because he has been very farsighted in understanding the significance of this part of the world to the United States.

I think all other aspects of the Silk Road proposal are good. Where we differ, as the Senator from Kansas indicated, is on that portion of the Silk Road called the "repeal of section 907."

Reasonable people can look at this and reach different conclusions. What the Senator from Kansas would like to see—I am perfectly confident in what I would like to see—is a settlement of this dispute between Azerbaijan and Armenia.

For our colleagues who have not paid a whole lot of attention to this part of the world, Nagorno-Karabakh is an almost entirely Armenian enclave, as the Senator from Kansas pointed out, within the territory of Azerbaijan connected by an area called the Lachin corridor. It is this area which is in dispute.

As the Senator from Kansas pointed out, Armenia won the conflict that occurred with the breakup of the Soviet Union, and it occupies not only Nagorno-Karabakh but the other territory adjacent thereto, which is Azeri.

The sad aftermath of that war is large refugee camps, which I visited, and the Senator from Kansas visited as well, of displaced people stuck in these refugee camps now for some 6 years, with the hopelessness and despair that develops in that atmosphere, reminiscent of an entire generation of Palestinians who have grown up in these camps in the Middle East. It breeds a fanaticism, a terrorism, that is an enormous unsettling aspect of life in that part of the world. Nothing could be better for that area than getting that dispute settled. I am sure the Senator from Kansas and I agree on that.

The question is, How do you best get there? The Senator from Kansas mentioned the Minsk Group. I am not very optimistic that the Minsk Group is going to bring about a settlement. The Minsk Group, in addition to including Azerbaijan and Armenia, includes Russia, France, and the United States. I think the Senator from Kansas and I probably agree that the Russians like things the way they are around there. There are Russian troops in all of those republics still, with the exception of Azerbaijan. Some are there by invitation, some are not by invitation. I think the Russians enjoy keeping the Caucasus destabilized, with all due respect to our occasional friends, the Russians. The French, who most of the time are our allies, I think frequently

are difficult in these negotiating situations.

These are the players: The French, the Russians, the Americans, the Armenians, and Azeris. Nothing has happened, and I am not optimistic something will happen until the United States thinks this is important.

Think of the money, time, and effort we have spent in the Balkans over the last 3 or 4 years. I happen to be in the minority in our party who think we have a national interest in the Balkans. I wish we had the interest in the Caucasus that we had in the Balkans, because we might have settled the dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. We have not had that, and nothing has happened.

The question before the Senate is, What kind of condition makes peace more or less likely to occur? Reasonable people can look at the same set of facts and reach a different conclusion.

The Senator from Michigan, Mr. ABRAHAM, and I have offered this second-degree amendment because we believe that section 907—even though it has been constantly stripped down—is important to give the Azeris some incentive for ultimate settlement. It is the view of the Senator from Kentucky that the lifting of 907 ought to be part of the final settlement between Armenia and Azerbaijan. To give it away in advance of final settlement makes final settlement less likely.

I completely respect the observations of the Senator from Kansas. As I said, reasonable people can differ about this. I think removing the last element of leverage in advance of the final settlement is not a step in the right direction.

We will have at some point today—although no time agreement can be entered at this point—a decision on this. I hope my colleagues will consider whether or not lifting this sanction in advance of a final settlement of the dispute is helpful in achieving a final settlement of the dispute.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I lend my support to this amendment. I realize the chairman and ranking member have a number of other issues they want to discuss. I am not sure at what point we will reconvene on this second-degree amendment.

I clearly associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky, both as a co-sponsor of the amendment as well as with his comments today. I share his view that the appropriate role for the United States at this point is not to decide this matter by taking this action—which I think would be premature; I think there still remain serious issues in play that would argue against changing the status of section 907 at this point. My view is that we should move forward with the balance of this amendment.

I, too, applaud the Senator from Kansas, who I think has done great work in

this area. I fully support his efforts as well as the contribution he makes by raising the section 907 issue. Hopefully, it puts all of our policymakers in the United States more in focus on the issues.

If we are to include the Silk Road Act or a major portion of it in this legislation, it should be included without inclusion of section 907. I am willing to speak on this at a later point if we extend the debate.

I appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Kentucky, and I look forward to working with him, as well as the Senator from Kansas, in hopefully resolving this.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I hope we can get a time agreement so we know when we will actually vote on this particular issue.

Reasonable people may differ, and will differ, on what the U.S. policy should be. Azerbaijan—section 907—is the only country from the former Soviet Union that we have unilateral sanctions against.

We are not lifting those sanctions by this amendment. We are allowing a national interest waiver to the President which is the same as the rest of the Freedom Support Act. In that sense, we will put Azerbaijan—which is at the gateway to much of the Eurasian platform as far as connecting the countries together—on an equal footing with all of the countries that came from the rubble of the former Soviet Union.

We seek peace in this region. It is important that we have a settlement in this region. This particular set of unilateral sanctions on Azerbaijan has been the United States policy since 1992. It has not led to peace since 1992.

We are seeking to create an abundance of activity, on a multilateral basis, of all the countries in the region, causing them to work together, to lift each other up economically, democratically, and regarding human rights, as an area, an entire region, that is developing on those principles of a free democracy—free, independent status, and human rights.

To pull this one out—it is a key corridor—the concept of the countries working together falls apart. It will not happen. It will not happen if we do that. That has been the U.S. policy since 1992. It has not led to peace yet between Armenia and Azerbaijan. I don't think it will now. If we get these countries to work together, to say, together we can support each other, we can grow economically in other ways, I think we create the atmosphere for peace to take place. Everybody has an interest in peace occurring.

We are talking about a large set of resources in this area. They do have the economic wherewithal to be able to grow and grow together. But we have to have them all. You can't pull one of them out and say it will not happen.

I think the proposal I put forward leads to peace and peaceful opportunities in the region. That is why I support it. I am happy to talk further



about this at a later date if we get a time agreement. With all due respect, I disagree with my colleagues from Kentucky and Michigan. I think we have the national interest waiver on section 907.

At the proper time, I will want a recorded vote on this so we can have a determination by this body of U.S. policy here.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Anne Alexander, a fellow in the office of Senator FEINGOLD, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. 1233.

I further ask unanimous consent Natalia Feduschak, an American Political Science Federation fellow in the office of Senator FRANK LAUTENBERG, be granted such floor privilege during debate and votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, again I remind Senators we have a unanimous consent agreement entered into by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to have all amendments in by 1 o'clock today. I urge him to do that. I had hoped we could wrap this bill up at a relatively early time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Kentucky, what is his desire at this time on this particular amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Kansas, we are unable to get a time agreement on this amendment at this time. It is my intention to lay it aside and deal with some other matters. We will keep working on it during the course of the day.

Mr. BROWNBACK. That is certainly acceptable to me. I suggest to the Senator from Kentucky, the manager of the bill, I have a second amendment dealing with the Sudan I am hopeful we can get worked out at some point in time, rather than calling it up. But if we cannot, I will seek recognition on that as well later on.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to my friend from Kansas, I am familiar with his other amendment. It is acceptable to me. If he will keep working on that, I think we should be able to get it cleared in the course of the day.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, while we are waiting for other Senators

to come up with amendments, I want to draw attention to an amendment I intend to offer if it is not accepted overall. It is an amendment entitled "Humanitarian Assistance for the Sudanese Opposition Groups."

This is a very simple amendment that would allow us to give food aid to the southern Sudanese resistance and also the northern Sudanese resistance efforts, food aid only. This is not other forms of aid. It is certainly not military aid. But it is food aid to the Sudanese resistance movement.

The language says, and I will provide the amendment:

The President is authorized to provide humanitarian assistance, including food, to the National Democratic Alliance [That is an overall alliance of the groups in opposition to the government in Khartoum] and the Sudanese People's Liberation Movement, operating outside of the Operation Lifeline Sudan structure.

That is the simple amendment we put forward.

I recently led a congressional delegation. Congressman DON PAYNE from New Jersey, Congressman TOM TANCREDO from Colorado, and I went to Sudan and traveled to southern Sudan and met with the embattled groups that have been fighting against the Khartoum government, which is a government that was not freely elected. They stood for election in 1988. They were defeated, got about 18 percent of the vote, and then took over the government in a coup in 1989 and have since then been operating a terrorist regime in Sudan. It is terrorist internally in Sudan and terrorist externally from Sudan.

They have killed, according to the IS Committee on Refugees, internally in Sudan, in the last 10 years, 1.9 million people in a genocide and ethnic cleansing the likes of which the world has not seen in recent times. This is the worst humanitarian situation in the world. That is according to the director of USAID, Mr. Atwood, who testified on the issue, on the Sudan—the worst in the world—nearly 2 million killed, over 4 million internally displaced. That is the internal terrorism of this government.

This is a government—and this is incredible—that actually allows slavery to exist. That is documented. The Baltimore Sun did a series of articles documenting this. Christian Solidarity International has bought back the freedom of over 6,000 slaves of northern people empowered by the Government to go south, kill the men in the village, take the women and children hostages, and make them slaves.

This is a picture taken by one of my staff members at Christmas this past year when she was in Sudan. This little boy is probably 11 or 12 years old. He is holding his arm out in this picture. It actually has on it his slave brand—branded slave.

What the Government in Khartoum does is, they allow people from the north to go down as raiders into these

communities, and part of what they get paid for is the slaves they can take. This is a closer picture of the little boy's arm showing the brand mark. They are taken and made to be herders, they are taken into sexual concubinage. The slave trade exists in the world today at the hands of the Government in Khartoum. It is absolutely unfathomable that this continues to occur. That is on top of the genocide and the ethnic cleansing that is taking place.

This is a picture of the civilian bombing that takes place within the country all the time. I was in Yei. The hospital in Yei has been bombed three times in the last year. They are taking old Soviet cargo planes, Antonovs, and they roll bombs out the back. They are indiscriminate. They are not militarily significant, but it kills a lot of people. It terrifies the people on the ground.

This is a picture of the hospital that has been bombed.

This photograph is, again, a civilian target. It has a big red X on the top of it, and that is part of the bombing that takes place.

This picture shows people who are watching for the bombers.

I put up a quick chart of the atrocities of the Government in the north. Remember, this amendment we are going to offer simply allows humanitarian aid to the resistance movement. It does not provide arms of any nature, but it does provide food aid to the resistance movement in Sudan.

This is what the Government in Khartoum has done. If people are going back and forth saying we are taking sides if we provide humanitarian aid to the resistance, I point out, the Government in Sudan is a terrorist regime as determined by the United States State Department. It is state-sponsored terrorism. They have housed Osama bin Laden since 1997. He stayed in Khartoum.

Most of the terrorist groups operating in the world have a base of operation in Khartoum. The Government in Sudan is supporting terrorist movements in three adjacent countries—Congo, Eritrea, and Uganda. They are seeking to expand this militant fundamentalism.

I pointed this out earlier:

Dead, 1.9 million people. It is the worst humanitarian situation in the world.

An internally displaced population of 4.3 million.

Last year, they let famine alone kill 100,000 people. Mr. President, this is the most incredible thing. Food sat in the country, and the Government in Khartoum would not let us fly relief planes into the area where they needed it, and the people died. They died at the hands of the Khartoum Government because they would not let our planes deliver the food aid.

Enslavement takes place, civilian bombings, forced religious conversions, terrorist threats throughout the region. This is the Government in Khartoum. This is the Government of



Sudan. If Members are hesitant to support food aid to the resistance movement, this is against whom they are fighting. This is arguably one of the, if not the worst regimes in the world for the treatment of its own people and attempts to export a militant fundamentalism and spread it throughout Africa. They housed the terrorist who tried to kill President Mubarak of Egypt. I mentioned the Government in Sudan housed Osama bin Laden.

This is a simple amendment. Rather than calling it up at the present time, I am making my colleagues aware, if it is not agreed to, I will be calling this amendment up and asking for a vote on this amendment. It is food aid to the opposition groups. It is not military aid. It is against the Government that supports the institutions of slavery, and it has the worst humanitarian situation in the world. Mr. President, 100,000 were killed last year. This is the least we can do.

I see other Members in the Chamber. I do not want to take additional time for this. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Minnesota.

#### PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Robin Goodman and Howard Kushlan, who are interns in my office this summer, and John Bradshaw, who is a fellow, be granted the privilege of the floor during the debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be laid aside. I say to my colleague from Kentucky, I will speak on an amendment I am going to offer just to save us time so we can move along today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1123

(Purpose: To combat the crime of international trafficking and to protect the rights of victims)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, today I will discuss one of the most horrendous human rights violations of our time—the trafficking of human beings, which is particularly prevalent among women and children, for the purposes of sexual exploitation and forced slavery.

Earlier this year, I introduced a bill, the International Trafficking of Women and Children Victim Protec-

tion Act of 1999, which addresses this issue. This legislation was cosponsored by Senators FEINSTEIN, BOXER, SNOWE, MURRAY, HARKIN, and TORRICELLI.

Today I am going to offer an amendment, which I will send to the desk shortly, to the foreign ops bill, which is basically this piece of legislation. If adopted, this amendment will put the Senate on record as opposing trafficking for forced prostitution and domestic servitude and acting to check it before the lives of more women and more girls are shattered.

Trafficking in human beings is one of the fastest growing international trafficking businesses. Women and girls seeking a better life, a good marriage, a lucrative job abroad, unexpectedly find themselves forced to work as prostitutes or in sweat shops. Seeking this better life, they are lured by local advertisements for good jobs in foreign countries at wages they could never imagine at home.

Every year, the trafficking of human beings for the sex trade affects hundreds of thousands of women throughout the world. That is hard to believe. Every year the trafficking of women and girls for sex trade affects hundreds of thousands of women or, for that matter, girls throughout the world.

The U.S. Government estimates that 1 million to 2 million women and girls are trafficked annually around the world. According to experts, between 50 and 100,000 women are trafficked each year into the United States alone. They come from Thailand, Russia, the Ukraine, and other countries in Asia and in the former Soviet Union.

Although trafficking has been a problem in some Asian countries, it was not until the breakup of the Soviet Union that a sex trade in that region began to flourish. This appalling trade has grown by leaps and bounds over the last decade. Trafficking is induced by poverty, lack of economic opportunities for women, the horrendous low status of women in many cultures, and the rapid growth of sophisticated and ruthless international crime operations.

Trafficking rings exploit and abuse poor, vulnerable women in the devastated economies of Russia, the Ukraine, and other countries in Central Europe, where women are unable to find jobs to sustain themselves and their families.

As many of you know, I am deeply concerned about what has taken place in Russia today. I am deeply concerned about it because I believe what happens in Russia, for better or for worse—and I hope it will be for better—will crucially affect the quality, or lack of quality, of our lives, our children's lives, and our grandchildren's lives. I suppose I am also concerned because my father was a Jewish immigrant who fled Russia.

In that country, we know that some 6.5 million women are unemployed, and 2.5 million children are not in school but they are in the streets. These

women and children are vulnerable to international organized crime that preys on the jobless, the destitute, the desperate, and the naive.

Upon arrival in countries far from their homes, these women from Russia and the Ukraine, and many other countries, are often stripped of their passports, held against their will in slave-like conditions, and sexually abused. It is just unbelievable that this is exactly what is happening. Rape and intimidation and violence are commonly employed by the traffickers to control their victims and to prevent them from seeking help.

Through physical isolation and psychological trauma, traffickers and brothel owners imprison women in a world of economic and sexual exploitation that imposes a constant threat of fear and deportation, as well as violent reprisals by the traffickers themselves to whom the women must pay ever growing debts.

Many brothel owners actually prefer foreign women—women who are far from help and home who do not speak the language—precisely because it is so easy to control them. Most of these women never imagined the life of hell they would encounter, having traveled abroad to find better jobs or to see the world.

Many, in their naivete, believed that nothing bad could happen to them in rich and comfortable countries such as Switzerland, Germany, or the United States. Others who were less naive but desperate for money and opportunity are no less hurt by the traffickers' brutal grip.

Last year, First Lady Hillary Clinton spoke powerfully of this human tragedy. She said:

I have spoken to young girls in northern Thailand whose parents were persuaded to sell them as prostitutes, and they received a great deal of money by their standards. You could often tell the homes of where the girls had been sold because they might even have a satellite dish or an addition built on their house. But I met girls who would come home after they had been used up, after they had contracted HIV or AIDS. If you've ever held the hand of a 13-year-old girl dying of AIDS, you can understand how critical it is that we take every step possible to prevent this happening to any other girl anywhere in the world. I also, in the Ukraine, heard—

The Ukraine actually was where my father was born—

of women who told me with tears running down their faces that young women in their communities were disappearing. They answered ads that promised [them] a much better future in another place and they were never heard from again.

We have had women from the Ukraine in our office, in face-to-face meetings, talking about the awful problem of women and young girls being exploited, leaving the Ukraine, coming to countries such as ours, and then finding themselves in this kind of situation.

These events are occurring not just in far off lands but in the United States as well. Earlier this spring, 6 men admitted, in a Florida court, to forcing 17

women and girls, some as young as 14, into a prostitution slavery ring. The victims were smuggled into the United States from Mexico with the promise of steady work, but, instead, they were forced into prostitution. The ring was discovered when two 15-year-old girls escaped and went to the Mexican consulate in Miami.

According to recent reports by the Justice Department, teenage Mexican girls were also held in slavery in the Carolinas and forced to submit to prostitution. In addition, Russian and Latvian women were forced to work in night clubs in Chicago. According to charges filed against the traffickers, the traffickers picked up the women upon their arrival at the airport, seized their documents and return tickets, locked them in hotels, and beat them. This is in our country. The women were told that if they refused to dance nude in various nightclubs, the Russian mafia would kill their families.

Further, over 3 years, hundreds of women from the Czech Republic who answered advertisements in Czech newspapers for modeling were ensnared in an illegal prostitution ring.

Because the victims of international trafficking are frequently unfamiliar with the laws, cultures, and languages of the countries to which they have been trafficked, these victims often find it difficult or impossible to report the crimes that have been committed against them or to assist in the investigation and the prosecution of such crimes. Further, victims do not have legal immigration status in the countries into which they are trafficked, so the victims are often punished more harshly than the traffickers themselves.

Trafficking in women and girls is a human rights problem. This is a human rights amendment that requires a human rights response. Trafficking is condemned by human rights treaties as a violation of basic human rights and as a slavery-like practice. Women who are trafficked are subject to other abuses—to rape, to beatings, to physical confinement—which are squarely prohibited by human rights law but are happening all around the world. The human abuses continue in the workplace in the forms of physical and sexual abuse, debt bondage and illegal confinement, and all are prohibited. But the practices go on.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes the right to be free from slavery and involuntary servitude, arbitrary detention, degrading or inhuman treatment, as well as the right to protection by law against these abuses.

The United Nations General Assembly has passed three resolutions during the last 3 years recognizing that international traffic in women and girls is an issue of pressing international concern involving numerous violations of fundamental human rights. The United Nations General Assembly is calling upon all governments to criminalize

trafficking, to punish its offenders, while not penalizing its victims.

Fortunately, the global trade in women and children is receiving far greater attention by governments and nongovernment organizations following the U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing. The President's Interagency Council on Women is working hard to mobilize a response to this problem. Churches and synagogues, and nongovernment organizations are fighting the battle daily, but much, much, much more must be done.

This amendment provides a human rights response to the problem. It has a comprehensive and integrated approach focused on prevention, protection, and assistance for the victims and prosecution of the traffickers.

I am going to highlight a few of the provisions in the amendment.

One, it sets an international standard for governments to meet in their efforts to fight trafficking and assist victims of this human rights abuse. It calls on the State Department and Justice Department to investigate and take action against international trafficking. In addition, it creates an Interagency Task Force in the Office of the Secretary of State to Monitor and Combat Trafficking and directs the Secretary to submit an annual report to the Congress on international trafficking.

The annual report would, among other things, identify states engaged in trafficking, the effort of those states to combat trafficking, and whether their government officials are complicit in the practice.

Corrupt government or law enforcement officials sometimes directly participate and benefit in the trade of women and girls. Corruption also prevents prosecution of the traffickers.

On a national level, as I look to this amendment, it ensures that our immigration laws do not encourage rapid deportation of trafficked women, a practice which effectively insulates traffickers from ever being prosecuted for their crimes. Trafficking victims are eligible for nonimmigrant status valid for 3 months. If the victim pursues criminal or civil actions against a trafficker or if she pursues an asylum claim, she is provided with an extension of time. Furthermore, it provides that trafficked women should not be detained but instead receive the needed services, the safe shelter, and the opportunity to seek justice against her abuser.

Finally, this amendment provides much-needed resources to programs assisting trafficking victims here at home and abroad. We must commit ourselves to ending the trafficking of women and girls and to building a world in which women and children are no longer subjected to horrendous abuses.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I have worked on this bill for a long time with a lot of groups and organiza-

tions. I believe this will have strong bipartisan support. I have tried to respond to a variety of different concerns. I say to my colleague from Vermont, as long as he doesn't think this is in the spirit of buttering him up, I view him as a champion in human rights work. I really believe this is consistent with his work. I think we ought to have this kind of response. I thought, in order to save time, I would speak on this amendment. I know there are other amendments that are on the floor.

I wonder whether I might send this amendment to the desk so that we will have it for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 1123.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I see my colleague from Illinois. I have another amendment that I could introduce, but for now, I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we have several Senators on the floor seeking recognition. The Senator from Minnesota, of course, had the floor. We are going to take a look at his amendment, which would not be in order for a vote right now. I listened to very much of what he had to say.

I am wondering if we could have an agreement that the Senator from New Jersey be recognized, the Senator from Oregon be recognized, and the Senator from Illinois be recognized next in that order.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator from Vermont add the Senator from California?

Mr. LEAHY. And then the Senator from California. I see the distinguished chairman is now on the floor. I am wondering if this might kind of expedite things. I do not think any of these Senators wish to speak for any great length of time.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey be recognized for 5 minutes, the Senator from Oregon be recognized for 5 minutes, the Senator from Illinois be recognized for 5 minutes, and the Senator from California be recognized for 5 minutes —

Mr. WELLSTONE. I wonder whether or not before colleagues speak, I could just send this amendment, the second amendment, to the desk so it is filed.

Mr. LEAHY. And then before this begins, that the Senator from Minnesota be recognized to send an amendment to the desk for appropriate filing purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1124

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is filed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I apologize to my friend, Senator LEAHY. I just walked onto the floor. Are the speakers here in relation to the Brownback amendment and the second-degree by myself and Senator ABRAHAM?

Mrs. BOXER. We are.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous consent, the Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, yesterday the citizens of South Florida watched in horror as live television cameras revealed an extraordinary spectacle. The hopes of freedom and the great traditions of America collided on the open seas with the harsh reality of the Clinton administration's arrangements with Castro's government in controlling immigration to the United States.

Six Cuban refugees who fought across the Florida straits came to within yards of the coast of the United States of America. Only a few feet from their destination, they leaped from the boat and attempted to swim to the shores of our country. They did so for the reasons that all of our ancestors and hundreds of thousands of other Cuban Americans came to the United States—with the belief that they could find freedom and security.

It was with horror, I am certain, on their part, but also by other Americans who watched this spectacle unfold as Coast Guard boats intercepted the swimmers. Men attempted to swim for their lives and were never given life-jackets. Surrounded by Coast Guard boats that generated large wakes, imperiling the lives of those who would swim to shore, Coast Guard crewmen used pepper spray against some of the swimmers. They were then taken into custody in handcuffs. Welcome to America.

It is essential that the Coast Guard, the Department of the Treasury, begin an immediate inquiry to revise these procedures to find out how this incident could have happened. Handcuffing refugees, using pepper spray, not helping those who were endangered on the high seas, subjecting them to the wake of large boats, allowing them to stay in the ocean for 15, 20 and, 30 minutes without assistance, no matter how you feel about Castro's government or immigration, no matter how you approach this issue, is not the role of the U.S. Coast Guard. It is not the policy of the U.S. Government. This is not how we treat refugees or people who are coming to our shores for freedom.

It reminds us that the problems of Castro's government are not yet addressed. This crisis is not yet over. In

the last 6 months, Amnesty International has reported that the total number of political prisoners in Cuba is now 350. In the last 6 months, there has been the arrest of four human rights dissidents petitioning their own government to recognize basic human rights. In just the last 6 months, the Cuban government has now passed laws making it a felony, punishable by 20 years in jail, to cooperate with the U.S. Government or any of its agencies. Things are not getting better in Castro's Cuba. They are getting worse.

As people flee that island for freedom, they deserve more and the people of the United States expect more than to have the agencies of this government used to continue an oppression, not at the hands of Castro but to threaten the lives of these refugees at the hands of our own agencies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous consent, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

AMENDMENT NO. 1119

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I will be brief. I rise to oppose the McCONNELL second-degree to the Silk Road amendment. I rise as a cosponsor of the bill.

We are constantly called upon in this country to pick sides among parties with ancient feuds. The area of the Silk Road, as defined in this bill, is an area that has long been beset with communism, Islamic fundamentalism, and other interests which, frankly, are inimical to U.S. interests.

Section 907 picks a side. I think it is founded on the best of motives but with the worst of results. At the end of the day, if we want to be honest brokers in this fight, it does not help us to be sanctioning one party at the table.

This isn't about oil; this isn't about some of the interests of the oil companies that want to develop in the Caspian; this is about being evenhanded; this is about getting beyond the status quo, which simply is not working.

In my view, it is appropriate to give the President the discretion to make a recommendation as to whether or not this sanction should continue. If he determines that it is working, fine, leave it in place. If not, I fear we will forever be caught up in picking sides on the Senate floor in conflicts we cannot ultimately end. I believe the U.S. posture in this very sensitive and important region of the world should be fair to both sides.

There are atrocities, human rights violations, on both sides. I wish there were just good guys and bad guys; unfortunately, there are plenty of both on both sides. In the end, I ask us to take a more evenhanded approach, support the Brownback bill and, ultimately, I believe, be more effective in this very sensitive negotiation in trying to foster peace, trying to foster development, trying to foster democracy in a part of the world that has known little of any of that.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from California, who has asked for 5 minutes, go before me and that I then be recognized for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the McConnell amendment. I thank the Senator for offering his amendment because, frankly, without it, a number of us will have problems supporting the underlying amendment by Senator BROWNBACK.

The Brownback amendment addresses a very important issue of revitalizing trade in that area of the world, and the problem with it is that it gives the President the authority to waive section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. The McConnell amendment strikes that portion from the Brownback amendment and, therefore, makes it a fine amendment. But without the McConnell amendment, I am afraid we are doing some very great harm and damage to human rights and to common decency.

Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act was enacted to place restrictions on United States government-to-government assistance to Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

I have very strong concerns about ending section 907, which is essentially what we are doing, because we know the administration's position on that. Doing that would reward the Azeri Government for taking no steps in lifting their blockade.

The blockade they have put on has prevented the transportation of basic human necessities, such as food and medicine, from reaching the suffering people of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I don't believe the United States should stand by and allow the Armenian people to live with a devastated economy, without a real commitment from Azerbaijan that they are taking steps to end the blockade.

Let me be clear about section 907 and what it does not do. It is not a sanction. In fact, the United States has normal trade relations with Azerbaijan. Section 907 does not prevent humanitarian aid from reaching Azerbaijan. It doesn't prevent the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, the Export-Import Bank, and the Trade Development Agency from functioning in Azerbaijan.

The only thing section 907 requires—and that is why I don't understand why Senator BROWNBACK wants to, in effect, repeal it—is that the Azeri Government "take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh." That is not a high hurdle to clear. If the Azeri Government cannot even take steps—small

steps—to end this blockade, I believe it has no right to the assistance that will be provided in the underlying Brownback amendment.

I understand Mr. BROWNBACK's amendment is well intentioned, and I enjoy working with him on many issues that affect the world. But because it would repeal section 907, I think if he were to accept Senator MCCONNELL's amendment, we would have a good underlying bill.

In closing, I wanted to read into the RECORD a brief comment made by Senator PAUL SARBANES in his minority views that he put into the RECORD. I serve on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I know Senator SARBANES believes strongly in this.

This is what he said:

Under current law, all Azerbaijan must do in order for section 907 to be lifted is to "take demonstrable steps to cease all blockades against Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh." This is an entirely reasonable expectation, especially given the basic purpose of this bill, which is to promote trade and economic cooperation between the countries of the region.

He points out:

For nearly a decade, the government of Azerbaijan has prevented the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other vital commodities to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, causing immense suffering.

So I ask the question of my friend, Senator BROWNBACK—in a rhetorical way, since he is not here—why would he want to do something that would only increase the suffering? Under the McConnell amendment, we cure this problem from his bill.

Senator SARBANES says:

During winters, much of the Armenian population has had to live without heat, electricity, or water. Schools and hospitals have been unable to function, and most Armenian industries have been forced to close down, crippling the economy and producing widespread unemployment and poverty.

We all want to see progress in the world. We want to see trade and jobs created. But we don't want to see more human suffering. I think if we go along with the Brownback amendment, without the McConnell amendment, we will be doing a disservice to the world.

I know I have a little time left. I have no further comment, and I yield the rest of my time to Senator MCCONNELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from California. I think she has it exactly right. The issue is whether, in the absence of a peace agreement between Azerbaijan and Armenia, the United States will have completely normal relations with Azerbaijan. I would like to see normal relations between our country and Azerbaijan. I would also like to see normal relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan. If all the leverage is removed in advance of an agreement, it seems to most of us that it makes the agreement less likely.

So I commend the Senator from California. She is absolutely correct on the merits. We hope the second-degree amendment will prevail.

Mr. DURBIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, with my colleagues' indulgence, I ask unanimous consent that I may follow the Senator for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a request on this side of the aisle for 10 minutes at that point, and then right after that would be acceptable to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I agree with Senators MCCONNELL and BOXER. Senator BROWNBACK calls for normalizing relations with Azerbaijan. Certainly that makes sense. We want to move toward the day when we have those normal relations. But we cannot overlook the fact that, for over 10 years, Azerbaijan has in fact imposed the blockade on Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, at great suffering to the people of that region.

It has stopped the transport of food, fuel, medicine, and other vital commodities to Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

Our foreign policy is basically premised on the belief that if we are going to have normal relations with Azerbaijan, they have to have normal relations with Armenia.

As Senator MCCONNELL said, Senator BROWNBACK has a vision for the future that we may share someday, but first we must address the concerns that Senator MCCONNELL addresses in his amendment. I support him. I think it is a very sensible approach. To waive section 907 in the absence of any progress toward lifting the blockade would reward the Government of Azerbaijan for failing to remove it.

Keep in mind that even though we have this section 907 restriction, we provide humanitarian and democracy-building assistance to Azerbaijan, and in fact the businesses of the United States do business there involving a lot of international agencies. But before we really normalize relations, let us demand a normalization of relations when it comes to the treatment of the Armenian people.

I don't need to remind anyone in this Chamber of the long and sad history of the Armenian people and the genocide which they endured. They have asked us to stand by them until they can resolve this peacefully. I think the United States is right to do so.

I object to the approach used by Senator BROWNBACK and fully endorse the efforts by Senator MCCONNELL.

FUNDING TO SEND LATIN AMERICAN STUDENTS TO THE U.S. ARMY SCHOOL OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. President, while the budget caps did not allow adequate funding for this bill, I want to complement Senator MCCONNELL and Senator LEAHY on the bill they have produced within the con-

straints they faced. I am particularly pleased that the bill includes funding for microcredit programs, with the expectation that the Agency for International Development will spend more for microcredit programs than last year. I am pleased that funding for the United Nations Population Fund is included in the bill. I am delighted that Foreign Military Financing funds for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been increased. These additional funds will help the Baltic countries meet their Membership Action Plans as they aspire to join NATO.

This bill contains International Military Education and Training (IMET) funds that are used for Latin American students to attend the U.S. Army School of the Americas. The school is the Army's Spanish-language training facility for Latin American military personnel, located at Fort Benning, GA. The school is a relic of the cold war with a horrendous legacy of teaching torture and assassination. It deserves to be closed for what it has taught in the past, what it stands for in Latin American democracies today, and what its counter-insurgency training at such a tainted institution may lead to in the future.

I had planned to offer an amendment to delete IMET funding for the school. However, I felt that my colleagues here in the Senate had not heard enough about the school, so I will not offer my amendment today. I introduced a bill, S. 873, to close the school. Our colleagues in the House have also introduced such a bill, H.R. 732, which now has 137 cosponsors.

Let me tell you why I think this school should be closed. I think you need only to look at the yearbook of the School of the Americas. Let me tell you what you will find. It is not surprising that among the graduates of the School of the Americas is the top of the list of the worst human rights abusers in Latin American current history. Listen as I read some of the graduates from the School of the Americas at Fort Benning, GA, an institution supported by U.S. taxpayers. These were people trained at the expense of the United States to return to Central America and lead. Listen to the people included:

19 Salvadoran soliders linked to the murder of 6 Jesuit priests, their housekeeper and her daughter in El Salvador in 1989;

48 of 69 Salvadoran military members cited in the U.N. Truth Commission's report on El Salvador for involvement in human rights violations;

Former Panamanian dictator and convicted drug dealer Manuel Noriega and nine other Latin American military dictators;

El Salvador death squad leader Roberto D'Aubuisson;

Two of the three killers of Archbishop Oscar Romero of El Salvador;

Mexican General Juan Lopez Ortiz, whose troops committed the Ocosingo massacre in Chiapas in 1994;

Guatemalan Colonel Julio Alpirez, linked to the murder of U.S. citizen Michael Devine in 1990 and Efraim Bamaca (husband of Jennifer Harbury) in 1992;

124 of 247—50 percent—of Colombian military officials accused of human rights violations in the 1992 work "State Terrorism in Colombia", compiled by a large coalition of European and Colombian non-governmental organizations;

Two of the three officers prosecuted by Guatemala for masterminding the killing of anthropologist Myrna Mack in 1992, as well as several leaders of the notorious Guatemalan military intelligence unit D-2;

Argentinian dictator Leopoldo Galtieri, a leader of the so-called "dirty war," during which some 30,000 civilians were killed or "disappeared";

Haitian Colonel Gambetta Hyppolite, who ordered his soldiers to fire on a provincial electoral bureau in 1987;

Several Peruvian military officers linked to the July 1992 killings of nine students and a professor from La Cantuta University;

Several Honduran officers linked to a clandestine military force known as Battalion 316 responsible for disappearances in the 1980's;

10 of the 12 officers responsible for the murder of 900 civilians in the El Salvadoran village of El Mozote; and

Three of the five officers involved in the 1980 rape and murder of four United States churchwomen in El Salvador.

This school is not the victim of a few isolated incidents of wrongdoing by its graduates. This list shows that human rights violations are endemic among its graduates, with far in excess of 200 murderers and other human rights violators on its past rolls.

Yet last week, when the commandant of the school, Col. Glenn R. Weidner, came to brief Senate staff on the school, he said "it doesn't take much to get on this list," that has been read in the Senate. I would say to the colonel what it takes is murder, rape, and torture. And the list is long and convincing.

I would also say to him that these 225 graduates have been confirmed by the Congressional Research Service. I did not include in my bill the other allegations of the School of the Americas graduates that could be independently confirmed. Can the school claim innocence in the actions of its graduates? Many do not think that is possible. For example, just a few months ago the Guatemalan Truth Commission report faulted the school's counterinsurgency training as having "had a significant impact on human rights violations during the armed conflict," a conflict that killed 200,000 people.

How, in the name of democracy, can we keep this school open?

I am not proposing that we hold U.S. foreign military training programs accountable for all of the actions of these graduates. We know from experience that people can be brutal with or without training. But why in God's name do we continue this?

Colonel Weidner also said that those wanting to close the school were isolationists, opposed to engaging in Latin America. Nothing could be further from my point of view. The question is how we engage.

Let me also say to those who suggest that these comments somehow are a reflection of criticism of the military of the United States that this school should close. The Army should support its closing. I think the men and women in uniform who serve this country do a wonderful job. But this school has not produced the kind of graduates for which we can take credit and pride. I believe it is an insult to American Army officers to have their own country's reputation sullied by an institution that has been associated with horrible crimes and human rights abuses committed by its graduates.

We should remove the albatross of their association from them and from our country by closing the School of the Americas.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, is there an amendment pending? I believe there is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an amendment pending by Senator WELLSTONE.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Wellstone amendment be temporarily laid aside so we may dispose of some managers' amendments that have been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1127 THROUGH 1145, EN BLOC

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send the managers' amendments to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) proposes the managers' amendments numbered 1127 through 1145, en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1127

On page 11, line 12 strike everything after the word "loans" and through the word "provision" on line 22.

On page 18, line 21, after the colon insert the following:

"Provided further, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be made available for political, economic, humanitarian, and associated support activities for Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraqi Liberation Act (Public Law 105-338); Provided further, That not less than 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds, the Secretary shall inform the Committees on Appropriations of the purpose and amount of the proposed obligation of funds under this provision:".

AMENDMENT NO. 1128

On page 7, line 13 strike the language beginning with "but shall be" through line 16 "Appropriations".

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I fully support this amendment that is included in the manager's package to strike language from S. 1234, the foreign operations appropriations bill, which would have suspended the availability of fiscal year 2000 funding for the Inter-American Foundation until the General Accounting Office completes an investigation of alleged civil and criminal wrongdoing by employees at the Foundation. I want to thank the managers of the bill and the chairman of the committee for their willingness to remove this language.

I think it is important to explain for the record why this language was included in the committee-reported bill and what led to the amendment to strike.

Several months ago, the GAO contacted the Appropriations Committee asking permission to investigate information provided to their fraud hotline regarding allegations of contract and hiring regulatory abuses at the Foundation. GAO forwarded a report on these issues to the committee on May 20, 1999. During the course of that investigation, additional anonymous allegations were made to GAO investigators by employees of the Foundation, and the GAO requested permission from the committee to brief the Board of the Foundation on those allegations. However, the committee initially decided that the GAO should investigate these additional allegations, and included language in the bill to restrict the Foundation's funding until the investigation was completed.

When apprised of the language included in the bill and the committee's intention to direct GAO to investigate these additional allegations, I raised the issue with Chairman STEVENS and asked him to reconsider this approach. After discussing the matter, we agreed that additional information on the nature of the allegations should be sought in order to determine the appropriate course of action.

Last week, members of my staff and the Appropriations Committee staff met with representatives of the General Accounting Office to discuss their findings regarding the administrative investigation which was completed on May 20, as well as the additional allegations. Based on the information received at that briefing and GAO's characterization of the additional allegations as administrative in nature, we determined that the more appropriate way to proceed would be to accede to the GAO's request to brief the Board of the Foundation on these matters and allow the Board members to determine what further action, if any, should be taken.

Chairman STEVENS and Chairman MCCONNELL advised me that, by referring the matter to the Board, the committee would view this investigation as

complete, and GAO would not be requested to conduct any further investigations of these matters. This amendment, therefore, removes any restrictions on IAF funding as well as any language that contemplates further GAO involvement in this matter, aside from advising the Board of their findings and the existence of additional allegations.

Mr. President, I fully support the decision to permit the General Accounting Office to brief the Board of the Foundation about allegations of misconduct at the Foundation. I believe that this is the appropriate and normal course of action in this type of matter, and I thank Senators STEVENS and MCCONNELL for agreeing to refer this matter to the Foundation's Board.

As my colleagues know, allegations of this sort are generally referred to an agency's inspector general for investigation and action, if necessary. Since the Foundation does not have an inspector general at this time, advising the Board or perhaps the Audit Committee of the Board (which functions as the Foundation's Inspector General) is the appropriate course of action, instead of pursuing a congressionally directed GAO investigation.

In addition, I sponsored and the Senate earlier adopted an amendment to S. 886, the foreign relations authorization bill, which requires the inspector general of the Agency for International Development to function in that capacity for the IAF, as well as the African Development Foundation. Hopefully, this will provide IAF with the oversight and investigatory authority to discover and deal with issues of this sort in the future, if necessary.

When our staff members were briefed by the GAO, they were advised of the specific nature of these so-called "criminal" allegations. The GAO characterized the allegations as administrative in nature, stating that, even if substantiated, these types of activities would very rarely draw criminal penalties and would instead be dealt with by a request for reimbursement or a reprimand, at most. In addition, it is important to know that most, if not all, of these allegations have already been reviewed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and their investigation found all of them to be unsubstantiated—a conclusion which the FBI addressed in a letter to the Foundation's Board Chair earlier this year.

Mr. President, I would never attempt to thwart any legitimate effort to uncover and eliminate fraud, unethical activities, or any type of misconduct in government or government-affiliated agencies. In this instance, however, I am concerned that these allegations about an individual at the Inter-American Foundation were designed to accomplish one end—the removal of that individual from effective employment at the Foundation because of his very successful efforts over the past several years to bring accountability, order, and legitimacy to an agency whose pro-

grams had been fraught with waste and abuse.

The individual involved discovered serious deficiencies and improprieties regarding the Foundation's grant-making program and the lack of oversight exercised by the Foundation program officers charged with overseeing Foundation grant organizations and contractors overseas. For example, this individual found that the Foundation had made grants to organizations in Ecuador involved in the kidnapping of U.S. citizens. This individual also took decisive action when it was discovered that the Foundation provided financial support to an organization in Argentina that engaged in acts of serious civil disobedience, including the seizure of public buildings and the blockage of roadways.

This individual also exposed fraudulent activities of overseas contractors of the Foundation, including the extortion of funds from Foundation grantee organizations. Finally, he established personnel time and attendance policies at the Foundation to correct rampant absenteeism and non-performance of duties.

This individual's successful efforts to make the Foundation's employees and Board accountable for their actions and decisions involving U.S. taxpayer dollars have caused some of these people to engage in a vendetta to remove him from his position at the Foundation, or at least minimize his effectiveness in that post.

Mr. President, regardless of the outcome of the Board's review of these latest retaliatory allegations against this individual, I believe there should be a thorough investigation of the Board and employees of the Foundation to ensure that the above-mentioned activities are no longer occurring. I also believe it would be prudent to determine whether improper hiring or personnel practices, misuse of government funds or equipment, theft or loss of government funds or property, conflicts of interest, or other improprieties or mismanagement—allegations similar to those falsely made against the individual involved in this matter—exist anywhere in the organization. These are matters that should be reviewed at the earliest opportunity by the AID inspector general, who will soon be serving as the inspector general for the Foundation.

Let me serve notice that I will continue to monitor activities at the Foundation with respect to the handling of this matter, and I will do everything in my power to ensure that the matter is resolved fairly and in a manner consistent with the handling of similar allegations in any other agency of government.

Again, I thank my colleagues for concluding the committee's involvement in this issue and referring the matter to the Foundation for appropriate administrative review.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1129

On page 7, line 22, after the colon, insert the following: "Provided further, That funds

made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the President of the Foundation: *Provided further*, That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further*, That this authority applies to interest earned both prior to and following enactment of this provision: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the \$250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall provide a report of the Committees on Appropriations before each time such waiver authority is exercised."

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1130

(Purpose: To provide up to \$5,500,000 to establish an International Health Care Center at Morehouse School of Medicine)

On page 8, line 6, after the word "AIDS" insert the following: "and including up to \$5,500,000 which may be made available to establish an International Health Center at Morehouse School of Medicine".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1131

On page 22, line 5, before the word "Ukraine" insert the words "Government of".

On page 22, line 6, after "1999", insert the following: "including taking effective measures to end corruption by government officials".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1132

On page 22, line 15, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That of the funds made available for Ukraine, \$3,500,000 shall be made available for the destruction of stockpiles of anti-personnel landmines in Ukraine".

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1133

On page 10, line 10, after the colon, insert the following:

"*Provided further*, That the proportion of funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for biodiversity activities should be at least the same as the proportion of funds that were made available for such activities from funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1995 (P.L. 103-306) to carry out sections 103 through 106 and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961".

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to reaffirm that protecting biodiversity is a key goal of our foreign policy. It is also to clarify language on page 23 of the Appropriations Committee report—Report 106-81, which incorrectly refers to fiscal year 1994. The year should have been 1995.

The United States, the birthplace of the global environmental movement, has led the way in supporting efforts to protect the incredible variety of plants and animals around the world. Yet because of shrinking budgets and changing priorities in Congress and at AID, our efforts to preserve the Earth's biodiversity have diminished. The consequences of this are profound, for ourselves and even more so for future generations. We cannot afford to neglect an area of environmental protection that so directly affects the lives of



American families and American industries.

AID's biodiversity activities include efforts to save species and ecosystems from extinction or degradation. Only 1.5 million of the estimated 10-50 million species have even been named and classified. Far fewer have been studied for their potential uses to humanity. Yet the destruction of natural habitats is leading to 100 extinctions every single day. AID also promotes genetic diversity. Genes that could have been lost to environmental destruction now improve and protect crops all over the world, and especially here in the United States.

In the United States, we reap the benefits of the world's biological diversity every day. Atmospheric pollution is reduced by tropical rainforests. Our cattle and crops are crossbred to improve their genetic traits. The pharmaceutical benefits alone are amazing. Diseases common in this country are cured with medicines that come from plants from around the world. The worldwide market for drugs derived from plants is \$40 billion. Who knows what new species will be discovered, leading to medicines that will benefit tomorrow's sick? No one does, which is why we cannot let a newly discovered species containing a possible cure for cancer, or AIDS, or even the common cold, go the way of the dinosaurs.

AID has led the way worldwide in supporting biodiversity, by working effectively with U.S. and foreign nongovernmental organizations, and foreign governments. For example, the Philippines, with its coral reefs and tropical forests, is one of the most biodiverse places in the world. It is also one of the most threatened. But through effective management, AID has helped place over 1.2 million acres of forest land under community stewardship and away from harm. AID has implemented similar projects elsewhere, working with governments to protect their own valuable resources.

Despite successes such as these, our biodiversity efforts are threatened. Since 1995, AID expenditures for biodiversity have decreased by nearly \$50 million, a nearly 50 percent reduction in just four years. Much of this decline is due to the steady reduction in our foreign aid budget. But even from this shrinking pie, biodiversity gets a thinner and thinner slice every year. In 1995, biodiversity spending was 5.1% of development assistance expenditures. By 1996 it was down to 4%. Then in 1998, expenditures were reduced to only 3.3%.

These disproportionate cuts have devastating consequences. The Philippines project I just mentioned will completely run out of funding next year. In Madagascar, a country that AID made one of its top biodiversity priorities over a decade ago, AID cut its biodiversity funding by \$900,000. In some ways Madagascar was lucky, because AID had originally planned to cut \$1.5 million dollars. And this is a

country that AID says is "Africa's most important biodiversity priority."

Obviously, we have many other development assistance priorities—in public health, in education, in family planning, in justice reform, to name a few. But we need a more balanced approach. I have spoken out more times than I can count in support of more funding for foreign aid. Foreign aid not only helps promote American interests abroad, but also provides direct benefits here at home. But even given the shrinking funds we devote to foreign aid, we must ensure that funding to protect biodiversity does not continue to suffer disproportionate cuts. We should resume the proportion of development assistance funding for biodiversity to the proportion it received in 1995. That is what my amendment would do.

I also want to be very clear about what we mean by "biodiversity." We mean "activities designed to support the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity—biomasses, ecosystems, species, or genetic diversity—by identifying needs, by designing, implementing and monitoring conservation and management actions; through research and training; or through institutional strengthening, policy interventions and program development." This is consistent with AID's definition of these activities.

Finally, we need to ensure that AID's Office of Environment and Natural Resources receives strong support. This office performs a vital function in the design, implementation and evaluation of conservation activities. Yet funding for it has been cut steadily since 1995, from \$25.6 million to \$6.9 million in 1999. That is totally unacceptable, and it seriously undercuts AID's capacity to exert leadership in this area.

Mr. President, I want to commend AID for its leadership in this area. I also want to ensure that it continues to exert that leadership. That requires adequate resources, and I intend to work with AID to balance the many competing development assistance programs to achieve that goal.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1134

On page 32, line 12, delete everything beginning with "For" through "expended" on page 33, line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct or indirect loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including necessary expenses for the administration of activities carried out under these parts), and of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 as amended; and concessional loans, guarantees and credit

agreements with any country in sub-Saharan Africa, as authorized under section 572 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-461); \$43,000,000, to remain available until expended; provided that any limitation of subsection (e) of Section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to the extent that limitation applies to sub-Saharan African countries shall not apply to funds appropriated hereunder or previously appropriated."

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1135

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress regarding which office in the Department of State is appropriate for managing United States interests in Ukraine)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

#### SENSE OF CONGRESS ON MANAGEMENT OF UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN UKRAINE

SEC. 580. (a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Ukraine is a major European nation as it has the second largest territory and sixth largest population of all the States of Europe.

(2) Ukraine has important geopolitical and economic roles to play within Central and Eastern Europe.

(3) A strong, stable, and secure Ukraine serves the interests of peace and stability in all of Europe, which are important national security interests of the United States.

(4) Ukraine is a member State of the Council of Europe, the Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Central European Initiative, and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Conference, is a participant in the Partnership for Peace program of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and has entered into a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with the European Union.

(5) The Government of Ukraine has clearly articulated its country's aspirations to become fully integrated into European and transatlantic institutions, and, in pursuit of the attainment of that aspiration, the government of Ukraine has requested associate membership in the European Union with the intent of eventually becoming a full member of the European Union.

(6) It is the policy of the United States to support the aspiration of Ukraine to assume its rightful place among the European and transatlantic community of democratic States and in European and transatlantic institutions.

(7) In the United States Government, the responsibility for management of United States interests in Ukraine would be most effectively performed by the officials who perform the responsibility for management of United States interests in Europe, and a designation of those officials to do so would strongly underscore and most effectively support attainment of the United States objective to build a Europe whole and free.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of State should designate the Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs to perform, through the Bureau of European Affairs of the Department of State, the responsibilities of the Department of State for the management of United States interests in Ukraine.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1136

(Purpose: To reduce the amount appropriated for contribution to the International Development Association)

On page 38, line 10, strike "\$785,000,000" and insert "\$776,600,000".

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, many people, including myself, were deeply



disappointed by the World Bank's June 24th decision to approve a \$160,000,000 loan to fund the controversial Western Poverty Reduction Project.

We recognize the strong views about this issue and I have agreed to accept this amendment, but with some reluctance.

The Western Poverty Reduction Project has drawn criticism from Members of Congress, the Clinton administration, other governments and international human rights and non-governmental organizations. A \$40,000,000 component of this project which would fund the resettlement of some 58,000 poor Chinese farmers into an historically and culturally distinct Tibetan and Mongolian area is the primary source of concern.

The \$9 million cut in IDA funds which would result from the Helms amendment is the United States contribution to this portion of the project.

I share Senator HELMS' concern that the project may put additional pressure on Tibetans and other ethnic minorities in the region who are already struggling to overcome economic and cultural marginalization under Chinese rule.

There are also serious questions about the project's impact on the environment. It is my understanding that the Bank did not follow its own procedures in considering the environmental impact of this loan.

The United States Executive Director at the Bank voted against the loan and I supported that vote.

While many of us are not happy with the June 24th decision, the fact is we voted on this loan just as we have on countless other loans over the years. We participated in the Board's democratic voting process, as established by the Bank's charter and agreed to by its shareholders, just as we always have. The United States was instrumental in establishing the Bank's voting rules.

What made this vote different, however, is that we lost.

With some 18 percent of the voting power on the Board, the overwhelming majority of the time the view of the United States prevails on the World Bank's Board and at other international financial institutions. We have become accustomed to getting our way.

However, in the rare instances when we do not, dismissing the process, renegeing on our financial obligations and walking away from our responsibilities is not an appropriate response. This is what this amendment does.

By cutting our contribution to IDA, which provides critical assistance to the world's poorest countries, this amendment compromises the democratic procedures at the Bank and damages United States credibility. It also invites other shareholders to cut their contributions to the Bank whenever they do not get their way. Taken to its logical conclusion, the damage to the Bank's ability to carry out its mission would be immense.

We have seen how we can influence this project by simply staying involved. United States intervention and persistent international pressure has already changed the way the Bank will proceed with this loan.

Under World Bank President James Wolfensohn's leadership, the Board made the highly unusual and commendable decision to delay disbursement of the \$40,000,000 until the Bank's independent inspection panel conducts a thorough review and determines whether the project meets the Bank's environmental and resettlement standards.

In addition, the Chinese Government has pledged its support for the review and stated that the press and government officials will have access to the region. Concerns about whether the project area will be open to experts unaffiliated with the Bank or the Chinese Government still need to be addressed.

It is expected that the Western Poverty Reduction project will be completed in 2005. By approving this amendment today and reducing our contribution to IDA we forfeit our leverage to influence the project and ensure that the Bank's environmental and resettlement standards are met over the next six years.

Mr. President, the plight of the Tibetan people is a clear example of what occurs when the principles of democracy are consistently and blatantly violated. In an effort to support their struggle, this amendment also compromises those same principles. It will weaken the United States' ability to ensure that the rights of Tibetans and other ethnic minorities are protected as the Bank moves forward with the project.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1137

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section:

#### SEC. . CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION WITH RESPECT TO ACQUISITION OF USAID FACILITIES.

(a) Funds appropriated under the heading "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development" may be made available for acquisition of office space exceeding \$5,000,000 of the United States Agency for International Development only if the appropriate congressional committees are notified at least 15 days in advance in accordance with the procedures applicable to reprogramming notifications under section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394-1).

(b) As used in this section, the term "acquisition" shall have the same meaning as in the Foreign Service Building Act of 1926.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1138

(Purpose: Regarding assistance for Haiti)

Beginning on page 92 delete Section 560 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI

SEC. 560. (a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in providing assistance to Haiti, the President should place a priority on the following areas:

(1) aggressive action to support the institution of the Haitian National Police, including support for efforts by the leadership and the Inspector General to purge corrupt and politicized elements from the Haitian National Police;

(2) steps to ensure that any elections undertaken in Haiti with United States assistance are full, free, fair, transparent, and democratic;

(3) a program designed to develop the indigenous human rights monitoring capacity;

(4) steps to facilitate the continued privatization of state-owned enterprises; and

(5) a sustained agricultural development program.

(b) REPORT.—Beginning six months after the date of enactment of this Act, and six months thereafter, the President shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives with regard to—

(1) the status of each of the governmental institutions envisioned in the 1987 Haitian Constitution, including an assessment of whether or not these institutions and officials hold positions on the basis of a regular, constitutional process;

(2) the status of the privatization (or placement under long-term private management or concession) of the major public entities, including a detailed assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has completed all required incorporating documents, the transfer of assets, and the eviction of unauthorized occupants of the land or facility;

(3) the status of efforts to re-sign and implement the lapsed bilateral Repatriation Agreement and an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has been cooperating with the United States in halting illegal emigration from Haiti;

(4) the status of the Government of Haiti's efforts to conduct thorough investigations of extrajudicial and political killings and—

(A) an assessment of whether or not substantial progress has been made in bringing to justice the persons responsible for these extrajudicial or political killings in Haiti, and

(B) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti is cooperating with United States authorities and with United States-funded technical advisors to the Haitian National Police in such investigations;

(5) an assessment of whether or not the Government of Haiti has taken action to remove and maintain the separation from the Haitian National Police, national palace and residential guard, ministerial guard, and any other public security entity or unit of Haiti those individuals who are credibly alleged to have engaged in or conspired to conceal gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(6) the status of steps being taken to secure the ratification of the maritime counter-narcotics agreements signed in October 1997;

(7) an assessment of the degree to which domestic capacity to conduct free, fair, democratic, and administratively sound elections has been developed in Haiti; and

(8) an assessment of whether or not Haiti's Minister of Justice has demonstrated a commitment to the professionalism of judicial personnel by consistently placing students graduated by the Judicial School in appropriate judicial positions and has made a commitment to share program costs associated with the Judicial School, and is achieving progress in making the judicial branch in Haiti independent from the executive branch.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1139

On page 24, line 18, strike all after "(h)" through the period on page 25, line 2, and insert the following:

Of the funds appropriated under this heading that are allocated for assistance for the

Central Government of Russia, 50 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that The Government of Russia has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1140

On page 22, line 24, after the word "Armenia" and before the period insert the following: "Provided, That of the funds made available for Armenia, \$15,000,000 shall be available for earthquake rehabilitation and reconstruction".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1141

(Purpose: To earmark Foreign Military Financing funds for the Philippines)

On page 37, line 11, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be available only for the Philippines".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1142

On page 12, line 6, insert a new section:

## LEBANON

Of the funds appropriated under the headings "Development Assistance" and "Economic Support Fund," not less than \$15,000,000 shall be made available for Lebanon to be used, among other programs, for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1143

On page 13, line 5, after the word "Appropriations" insert the following words: ", the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House."; and

On page 98, line 16, after the word "Appropriations", insert the following words: ", the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House.".

## AMENDMENT NO. 1144

(Purpose: To earmark funds for the independent states of the former Soviet Union for the REAP International School Linkage Program)

On page 21, line 22, before the period insert the following: "Provided further, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$200,000 shall be available only for the REAP International School Linkage Program".

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, REAP International operates a school linkage program between North Dakota and the Russian Republic of Buryatia. In the past, this program has resulted not only in the establishment of close personal relationships, but also provided community based assistance and sustainable development to this important region of the Russian Far East. REAP International's school linkage program between North Dakota and Buryatia is all the more critical when one considers the setbacks that the U.S.-Russia relationship has suffered in the wake of NATO's actions against Serbia. In addition, the failure of the Russian economy has left many Russians disillusioned, and there are those in the Russian leadership who would take ad-

vantage of that disillusionment in order to reverse the free market reforms already underway in Russia. We must not let that happen. One way to prevent it is to help Russian youth to understand and reap the benefits of a stable, free market economy through student exchange programs.

Student exchange programs often promote long-lasting relationships between institutions and communities. Does the Senator agree that these programs also play an important role in strengthening ties between countries?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. REAP International's school linkage program with Buryatia, Russia focuses on economic development activities, vocational and entrepreneurial training, and the enhancement of civic institutions. These types of activities are important in stabilizing communities in the Russian Far East. Is this type of stability not vital if Russia is to move ahead with economic reforms?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I concur in the Senator's assessment that stability is a necessary prerequisite for the transition to a market economy, something we all hope Russia is able to achieve.

Mr. DORGAN. And would the Senator also agree that the development of the Russian Far East is vital to the overall future development of Russia's market economy, and therefore it is critical that we support efforts to foster sustainable development and stability in this important region?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I certainly agree with that.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chairman for his comments and support.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1145

(Purpose: To restrict United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Balkans to United States-produced articles and services)

On page 128, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following new section:

## RESTRICTION ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN THE BALKANS REGION.

## SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for United States assistance for reconstruction efforts in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or any contiguous country may be used for the procurement of any article produced outside the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries, or any service provided by a foreign person.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if—

(1) the provision of such assistance requires articles of a type that are produced in and services that are available for purchase in the United States, the recipient country, or least developed countries, or if the cost of articles and services produced in or available from the United States and such other countries is significantly more expensive, including the cost of transportation, than the cost from other sources; or

(2) the President determines that the application of subsection (a) will impair the ability of the United States to maximize the use of United States articles and services in such reconstruction efforts of other donor coun-

tries, or if the President otherwise determines that subsection (a) will impair United States foreign assistance objectives.

## (c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARTICLE.—The term "article" means any agricultural commodity, steel, communications equipment, farm machinery, or petrochemical refinery equipment.

(2) FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA.—The term "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" means the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and includes Kosovo.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term "foreign person" means any foreign national exclusive of any national of the recipient country or least developed countries including any foreign corporation, partnership, other legal entity, organization, or association that is beneficially owned by foreign persons controlled in fact by foreign persons.

(4) PRODUCED.—The term "produced", with respect to an item, includes any item mined, manufactured, made, assembled, grown, or extracted.

(5) SERVICE.—The term "service" means any engineering, construction or telecommunications.

(6) STEEL.—The term "steel" includes the following categories of steel products: semi-finished, plates, sheets and strips, wire rods, wire and wire products, rail type products, bars, structural shapes and units, pipes and tubes, iron ore, and coke products.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I intend to support the Manager's amendments package to the Fiscal Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000, which includes a modified version of a bill I introduced on June 10th, S.1212, the Kosovo Reconstruction Investment Act of 1999. I am pleased to have Senators RICK SANTORUM and ROBERT BYRD join me as original cosponsors of this amendment.

I also want to thank the Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, Senator MCCONNELL, and the Subcommittee's Ranking Member, Senator LEAHY, for their assistance and support of this amendment.

While this amendment's language is a compromise, and is not as strong as S. 1212 which I introduced earlier this month, it is an important first step in the right direction. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the coming months to help promote American taxpayers, workers and key industries as the U.S. begins to spend billions of dollars to rebuild Kosovo and, as expected in the future, the rest of Yugoslavia.

This amendment will help American workers and companies get the first best shot at those Kosovo reconstruction opportunities that are being paid for with U.S. foreign aid funds. As a result, a large portion of the American taxpayer's dollars destined for the Kosovo reconstruction effort will be invested in the purchase of American made goods and services whenever possible.

This legislation will benefit both the people of Kosovo and American workers. The people of Kosovo will have reconstructed homes, hospitals, factories, bridges, powerplants and telecommunications systems. The American people will benefit as a significant portion of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars come back to the U.S. in the form

of new orders for American made goods and services. New jobs will be created. With this legislation we can make the best out of a looming, costly, and long term burden on our nation's budget.

This will be especially important for some of our key industries, such as agriculture and steel, that are facing hard times here at home. Other hard working Americans from industries like manufacturing, engineering, construction, high tech and telecommunications will also enjoy new opportunities to produce goods and services destined for export overseas.

For example, our ranchers and farmers, many of whom are being severely harmed by a combination of tough competition at home, cheap imports and closed markets overseas will benefit. This bill will help provide them with the opportunity to strengthen their share in Europe's Southeastern markets.

Our steel workers, many of whom are also in a tough situation, will benefit as U.S. made steel is used to reconstruct, homes, hospitals, factories, bridges and other necessary infrastructure. American steel would also be used as American made construction equipment and tractors are delivered to the Balkans. American engineers, contractors and other service providers will play a key role in rebuilding telecommunications and other necessary infrastructure projects.

The American taxpayers have already borne the lion's share of waging the war in Kosovo. Our pilots flew the vast majority of the combat sorties. In addition, the Foreign Operations Supplemental Appropriations bill that passed last month provided \$819 million for humanitarian and refugee aid for Kosovo and surrounding countries. It has been estimated that peace keeping operations will cost an additional \$3 billion in the first year alone. This is just the beginning. In the future, American taxpayers will be spending tens of billions of dollars more as we participate in what apparently is an open-ended peacekeeping effort.

Without this legislation those countries who largely sat on the sidelines while we fought will be allowed to sweep in and clean up. The American taxpayers' dollars should not be used to profit Western European conglomerates. The American people deserve better. This Kosovo Reconstruction Investment Amendment will help remedy this situation.

Yet another problem this bill would help alleviate is our exploding trade deficit which is on track to an all time high of approximately \$250 billion by the end of this year. In March of this year alone, the U.S. posted a record one month trade deficit of \$19.7 billion.

Furthermore, many of the other industrialized countries that regularly distribute foreign aid do not do so with no strings attached. For many years now, countries like Japan have also required that the foreign aid funds they distribute be used to buy products produced by their domestic companies.

The degree to which the Japanese government uses "tied aid" to the benefit of Japanese companies and boost their exports was underscored by a recent quote that can be found in the June, 1999, issue of the "Look Japan" magazine. When referring to Japanese efforts to help neighbor countries recover from the Asian economic crisis, Oshima Kenzo, the Director of the Economic Cooperation Bureau at Japan's Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated:

This enormous machine of Japanese aid has barely begun to move. Aid to Asian countries in crisis is something that must be done on an "all-Japan" basis . . . The purpose of aid to Asia is primarily to provide relief to Asian countries, but it has a secondary aspect of reenergizing the Japanese economy too, so there are many domestic hopes riding on this as well.

While my original Kosovo reconstruction language in S. 1212 included tougher "Buy America" provisions, this amendment's compromise language will allow U.S. foreign aid funds to be used to purchase goods and services produced in "least-developed countries." This is something we can do while still serving the purpose of this amendment. For example, U.S. steel workers will still have the first shot at producing steel for the Kosovo reconstruction effort since countries such as Japan, South Korea and Brazil, all of whom have been taking a heavy toll on the U.S. steel industry here at home, most definitely are not "least developed countries." American telecommunications, heavy equipment manufacturers and a wide variety of other U.S. industries will also benefit.

If America's Airmen, Sailors, Marines and Soldiers are good enough to wage a war, then America's hard working taxpayers, including steel and manufacturing workers, engineers and contractors are good enough to help rebuild shattered countries. If we are called on to put the Balkans back together, we should do it with a fair share of goods and services made in America.

I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. As I said, this is a list of managers' amendments that has been cleared on both sides of the aisle:

McConnell-Leahy amendment to move the Iraqi provision;

McCain amendment to strike Inter-American Foundation language with a statement;

Leahy-McConnell amendment on African Development Foundation provision;

Stevens-Coverdell amendment on AIDS;

McConnell-Leahy on Ukraine corruption;

Leahy-McConnell amendment on Ukraine demining;

Leahy amendment on biodiversity;

Leahy amendment on debt restructuring;

Roth amendment on Ukraine;

Helms amendment on IDA-China;

Helms amendment on USAID construction notification;

Helms-DeWine amendment on Haiti;  
Leahy-McConnell amendment on Russia-Iran;

McConnell amendment on Armenia;  
Helms amendment on the Philippines;

Abraham amendment on Lebanon;  
Thomas amendment on technical correctional reports;

Dorgan amendment on Russia exchanges; and

A Campbell amendment on Buy America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1127 through 1145), en bloc, were agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Senator LAUTENBERG be shown as a cosponsor of the Roth amendment on the Ukraine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I understand the Senator from Illinois will be recognized. Then the Senator from Minnesota is going to be recognized. I ask unanimous consent I then be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I will speak for a few moments today about an issue of great concern to me and many other Members. In the last few days in Washington, there has been literally a euphoria over the notion we in Washington are running large budgetary surpluses on an annual basis. The uncorking of champagne bottles all around town has taken place on the notion that, because we are running surpluses, we are somehow paying down the national debt.

Yesterday, the New York Times had an article on page 14 entitled, "Clinton Sees the Possibility of Zero U.S. Debt by 2015."

As I will show, this article is dead wrong. The article stated that the entire national debt, which now stands at over \$5.6 trillion, will be paid down by the year 2015. It went on to state that the debt clock in New York, which is a daily tally of the Federal national debt, would be down to zero by the year 2015.

It turns out that is dead, flat wrong. In fact, the national debt is now rising. It is going to continue to rise every year of the President's 15-year projections. The total national debt by the year 2015, as listed on that debt clock in New York, will stand at more than \$7 trillion.

How can this be? We have heard from Washington that we are running large